APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/506,640	02/18/2000	Beat Laemmle	99P7475US01	8044

7590   07/21/2003

I Marc Asperas
Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER
HO, THE T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2003   10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _5/9/2003_ .

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-58_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-58_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

　　If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

　　a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 5/9/2003.

2. Claims 1-58 have been examined and are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Koppolu U.S Patent No. 6,460,058.

As to claim 1, APA discloses a specific instance has specific parameters (specific

instance of an object, line 19 page 4) associated with a programmable logic controller

(PLC, line 3 page 5) coupled to an operating system (line 1 page 5), the specific

instance is not registered with the operating system (no conventional way in which to

register itself with the operating system, line 4 page 5). However, APA does not

disclose register the instance.

Koppolu discloses determining if the specific instance is not registered (253, Fig.

8A); and registering the specific instance (registers the IBindStatusCallback, line 33

column 34). It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Koppolu to the

system of APA because by registering the instance, an asynchronous bind context is

created for use with the asynchronous moniker as disclosed by Koppolu (lines 30-45 column 34).

As to claim 2, Koppolu further discloses registering does not register objects that are not running (254-259, Fig. 8A).

As to claim 3, APA as modified further discloses remotely coupling (remotely connected, line 7 page 5) the programmable logic controller to the processor (connected to a PC, line 3 page 5).

As to claim 4, Koppolu further discloses remotely coupling over the Internet (second paragraph column 3).

As to claim 5, Koppolu further discloses obtaining an object name (142, Fig. 5) associated with the specific instance from a memory location (80, Fig. 5) allocated for the programmable logic controller.

As to claim 6, Koppolu further discloses parsing a display name (display name which remains to be parsed, lines 61-62 column 51) of the object to generate a parsed display name (parses into a new moniker, lines 63-64 column 51).

As to claim 7, Koppolu further discloses creating a pointer moniker using the parsed display name (become the current moniker, line 67 column 51).

As to claim 8, Koppolu further discloses binding the pointer moniker to server (Fig. 4).

As to claim 9, Koppolu further discloses creating an item moniker using a portion of the parsed display name (combines into a composite moniker, line 6 column 52) to the right of a part corresponding to the pointer moniker (lines 3-13 column 52).

As to claim 10, Koppolu further discloses binding the item moniker to server (Fig. 4).

As to claim 11, Koppolu further discloses recursively creating item monikers for items (each successive moniker is able to parse a next more specific portion of the display name into a moniker, lines 7-8 column 52).

As to claim 12, Koppolu further discloses binding a leftmost portion resulting monikers to server (Fig. 5).

As to claim 13, note the discussions of claims 1-3 above. Koppolu further discloses a running object table (running object table 253, Fig. 8A).

As to claim 14, Koppolu further discloses converting a program ID to obtain a class ID (lines 16-32 column 52).

As to claims 15-17, note the discussions of claims 6-8 above, respectively.

As to claim 18, Koppolu further discloses instantiating the specific instance (instantiating the named object, lines 42-43 column 31) using the pointer moniker (asynchronous moniker, line 44 column 31).

As to claim 19, Koppolu further discloses registering the specific instance without changing a tagfile server name (line 58 column 51 to line 13 column 52).

. As to claim 20, Koppolu further discloses binding a pointer moniker to a client (Fig. 5).

As to claim 21, note the discussions of claims 1-2 above. Koppolu further discloses a memory and a processor (40 and 22, Fig. 1).

As to claims 22-23, note the discussions of claims 3-4 above, respectively.

As to claims 24 and 25, Koppolu does not explicitly disclose USB and COM connections. However, Koppolu teaches that other physical connections to the computer network alternatively can be used (lines 38-40 column 8). It would have been obvious to consider that these physical connections could be USB or COM since such teachings are conventional.

As to claim 26, Koppolu further discloses a dynamic link library (dynamic link library, line 56 column 11).

As to claim 27, Koppolu further discloses a display (30, Fig. 1).

As to claim 28, Koppolu further discloses transforming signals into signals of a predetermined format for display on the display (lines 6-22 column 8).

As to claim 29, Koppolu further discloses a PC (Fig. 1).

As to claim 30, note the discussion of claim 3 above.

As to claims 31-32, APA does not explicitly disclose a plurality of programmable logic controllers and master-slave relationship. However, a computer could have multiple connections to a plurality of programmable logic controllers in which one programmable logic controller is in control of the other programmable logic controllers since such teachings are conventional.

As to claim 33, Koppolu further discloses a firmware (adapter card, line 43 column 8).

As to claim 34, Koppolu further discloses the firmware provides identification information for registering the specific instance (lines 36-49 column 8).

As to claim 35, Koppolu further discloses a personal computer card (adapter card, line 43 column 8).

As to claim 36, note the discussion of claim 21 above.

As to claims 37-38, note the discussions of claims 3-4 above, respectively.

As to claims 39-50, note the discussions of claims 24-35 above, respectively.

As to claims 51-52, note the discussions of claims 21 and 14 above, respectively.

As to claims 53-55, note the discussions of claims 6-8 above, respectively.

As to claims 56-58, note the discussions of claims 18-20 above, respectively.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that Koppolu does not teach: "registering said specific instance...operating system's registration" (Remarks, fourth paragraph page 3). In response, while the applicant argued that the reference does not teach the limitation, the argument was not discussed in detail of how the limitation was not met by the reference. As discussed in the claim rejection above, Koppolu discloses determining if the specific instance is not registered (253, Fig. 8A); and registering the specific instance (registers the IBindStatusCallback, line 33 column 34). The reference meets the limitation as broadly claimed.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to The Thanh Ho whose telephone number is 703-306-5540. A voice mail service is also available for this number. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday, 8:30 am – 5:00 pm.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or fax to:

- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746 – 7238

- OFFICAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746 – 7239

- NON OFFICAL faxes should not be signed, please send to (703) 746 – 7240

TTH
July 15, 2003

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100